



Translation of the pertinent portions of a Notification  
Regarding the Forwarding of the International Preliminary  
Report in Regard to Patentability, mailed 10/26/2005

2. This REPORT comprises a total of 7 pages, including this cover page.

3. ATTACHMENTS have been attached to this report, these contain

a. X (sent to applicant and the International Office) a total of 6 pages

4. This report contains information regarding the following items:

- I Basis of the Report
- IV Lack of Unity of the Invention
- V Reasoned Determination under Article 35(2)

Field No. I Basis of the Report

1. Regarding the **language** the report is based on the International Application in the language in which it was filed, if nothing different has been noted under this point.

2. Regarding the **contents** of the International Application, this report is based on

**Specification, pages**

3 to 32 in the originally filed version.  
1, 2 filed with the application

**Claims, nos.**

1-13 filed with the application

**Drawings, sheets**

1/14 - 14/14 in the originally filed version.

3. This report was prepared without taking into consideration (some of) the changes added to this report and listed in what follows since, for the reasons mentioned in the attached sheet, in the opinion of the Office these go beyond the disclosure of the originally filed version (Rule 70.2 c)).

x Claim 16

#### Field IV Lack of Unity of the Invention

1. Upon a request to limit the claims or paying additional fees, Applicant has

paid additional fees

4. Therefore this report was prepared for

x all parts of the international application.

## Field V Reasoned Determination under Article 35(2)

## 1. Determination

**Novelty** Yes: Claims 1-15, 17-23  
No: Claims

Inventive Activities Yes: Claims 1-15, 17-23  
No: Claims

Commercial Applicability Yes: Claims 1-15, 17-23  
No: Claims

## 2. References and Explanations (Rule 70.7):

see the attached sheet

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

ATTACHED SHEET

Re.: Item I

The changes filed with the communication of 07/28/2005 introduce matter which, in contradiction to Article 34(2)(b) PCT goes beyond the disclosure of the international application at the time of filing. These are the following changes:

Because of the dependency of claim 16 from independent claim 15, the combination of the respective seating is now in levers, as well as in eccentric devices.

In the original version these combinations were separate (see page 21, paragraph 2, and orig. claims 15, 16, and 17).

The subject of present claim 16 will not be further prosecuted because of a lack of original disclosure.

Re.: Item IV

The International Search Authority has determined that this international application contains several (groups) of inventions, which not connected by a single common inventive idea, namely:

I. Claims: 1 to 5, 7 to 14, 23

"The drive motor can be moved together with the traversing roller, which is seated so it is movable perpendicular to the axis of rotation."

II. Claim: 6

"Coupling means between the drive shaft and the body of the traversing roller."

III. Claims 15 to 22, 24

Relation of the pivot shafts of two pivotable rollers in contact with each other.

For the following reasons these inventions/groups are not connected with each other that they would realize a common inventive idea (Rule 13.1 PCT):

The general idea connecting independent claims 1 and 6 with each other consists of the following characteristics:

"A roller of an inking or dampening system, which is axially movable by a traversing drive mechanism and has a rotary drive mechanism".

The general idea connecting independent claims 1 and 15 with each other consists of the following characteristics:

"Roller of an inking or dampening system which is movable perpendicular to the axis of rotation".

The general idea connecting independent claims 6 and 15 with each other consists of the following characteristics:

"Roller of an inking or dampening system."

However, these common characteristics already ensue from the publication DE-A-44 30 693 (see the reference in the search report).

Therefore there is no technical connection between claims 1, 6 and 15 within the meaning of Rule 13(2) PCT, so that unity as required by Rule 13(1) PCT has not been provided.

#### Re.: Item V

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1:  
D2:  
D3:  
D4:

#### **Invention I:**

The closest prior art in regard to the subject of claim 1 is represented by document D1. D1 shows (see the reference in the search report): a roller of an inking or dampening system, which can be axially moved by means of a traversing drive mechanism and has an individual drive mechanism embodied as a drive motor for driving it rotatorily.

The subject of claim 1 differs from this in that the roller is seated so that it can be moved in a direction perpendicular to its axis of rotation, and that the drive motor is arranged for movement together with the roller which can be traversed.

Therefore the subject of claim 1 is novel.

By means of this a cost-effective and simple solution for the rotatory driving of a traversing roller is achieved, particularly since the customary interposition of a compensating gear for a stationary motor can be avoided.

The known publications were not able, neither by themselves nor in combination with each other, to suggest the subject with the characteristics of claim 1 for the mentioned purpose.

Therefore claim 1 is based on inventive activities and meets, together with the advantageous further embodiments of dependent claims 2 to 5, 7 to 14 and 22, the requirements of Article 33(1) - (4) PCT.

#### **Invention II:**

The closest prior art in regard to the subject of claim 6 is represented by document D2. D2 shows (see the reference in the search report): a roller of an inking or dampening system, which can be axially moved by means of a traversing drive mechanism and can be rotated by means of a drive mechanism arranged on the opposite front end.

The subject of claim 6 differs from this in that a coaxial drive shaft of the rotatory drive mechanism is arranged to be stationary in the axial direction, and coupling means are provided, which assure a transfer of a torque from the drive mechanism via the stationary drive shaft to the roller body, but permit an axial relative movement between the roller body and the drive shaft.

Therefore the subject of claim 6 is novel.

By means of this it is possible to absorb the axial lift by the roller and not by the drive mechanism, which can bring advantages regarding cost and structural space.

The known publications were not able, neither by themselves nor in combination with each other, to suggest the subject with the characteristics of claim 6 for the mentioned purpose.

Therefore claim 6 is based on inventive activities and meets, together with the advantageous further embodiments of dependent claims 7 to 14 and 22, the requirements of Article 33(1) - (4) PCT.

### **Invention III**

Each one of publications D3 and D4 constitutes the prior art in connection with the subject of claim 15.

Each one of documents D3 and D4 discloses (see the reference in the search report): an inking (D4) or dampening (D3) system with two rollers which work together in the print-on position (D3: 15, 25; D4: 4, 3), wherein the two rollers are arranged to be pivotable and that the pivot shaft of the first roller (D3: 25; D4: 3) coincides with the axis of rotation of the second roller (D3: 15; D4: 4).

Furthermore, one of the two rollers (D3: 15; D4: 4) is seated in eccentric bushings. Document D3 moreover discloses that the first roller (25) is embodied as a distribution roller of a dampening system.

The subject of claim 15 furthermore differs from this prior art in that the front ends of the two rollers are seated in levers, and that a pivot shaft of the lever of the first roller coincides with the axis of rotation of the second roller.

Therefore the subject of claim 15 is novel.

By means of this it is possible to create a pivoting arrangement of two cooperating rollers, whose position in relation to each other in a pivoting range is not hampered.

The known publications were not able, neither by themselves nor in combination with each other, to suggest the subject with the characteristics of claim 15 for the mentioned purpose.

Therefore claim 15 is based on inventive activities and meets, together with the advantageous further embodiments of dependent claims 17 to 23, the requirements of Article 33(1) - (4) PCT.